

REMARKS

Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1, 2 and 5-18 will be pending in the application. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections detailed in the Office Action based upon the following comments.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action maintains the following obviousness rejections:

1) claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, and 18 are rejected based upon Greschner in view of Kandachi, and Yanagisawa; and

2) claims 1, 2, and 5-18 are rejected based upon Greschner in view of Kandachi, Yanagisawa, and EP App. No. 860,720.

Claim 1 has been amended to define that the timing of the forcible separation of the mold from the base material is determined so that the relations $T_1 \geq T_2$ and $|\alpha_a - \alpha_b| \cdot (T_1 - T_2) \cdot d \leq 4 \times 10^{-2}$ are met.

Applicants again remark that $T_1 - T_2$ is a factor that can easily be controlled. This factor can be lowered by forcibly separating the mold from the base material. The left hand side of $|\alpha_a - \alpha_b| \cdot (T_1 - T_2) \cdot d \leq 4 \times 10^{-2}$ can be lowered by making $T_1 - T_2$ small even when other factors are relatively large. This means, for example, the present invention makes it possible to accurately transcribe a micro pattern to a wide area of resin having a large thermal expansion coefficient. As explained in the application on page 5, resin has a thermal expansion coefficient 1 to 2 digits larger than that of quartz, which could be used for the mold material.

Applicants believe that cited references do not teach the invention as presently claimed. For example, reference is made to column 4, lines 3-8 of Greschner, which explains that “the glass substrate is to be cooled after the forming process, while still in contact with the stamp”.

Applicants also submit that the Office Action does not set forth sufficient reasoning supporting the rejection of claim 8, which specifies resins being used as the base material. The cited prior art relates to soda-lime glass.

Claim 9 has also been amended and is respectfully submitted to not be obvious in view of the cited prior art.

Further, the temperatures set forth in claims 12-18 are not taught, hinted, or suggested by the cited prior art. As such a proper *prima facie* rejection has not been set forth for these claims.

Due to the foregoing, Applicants assert that the rejections should be withdrawn because pending claims 1, 2 and 5-18 are not obvious in view of the cited prior art.



CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this response, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300. Any overpayment can be credited to Deposit Account No. 02-4300.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 6, 2004

Signature:

Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263
Smith, Gambrell & Russell, L.L.P.
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300

SGRDC/208946.1